Michael Phillips
November 29, 1973

AN EVALUATION OF MY FIRST YEARS GRANTS, PLUS A FEW 2ND YEAR GRANTS

Since my destination paper and my first two years of making grants, I have had a change in my general viewpoint. My grants are now seen in the perspective set out in the attached Futureland which describes my experiences in learning about a different culture (Japan) which gives me hope for a better society, and The New Planet paper which describes my 50 year objectives for building that new society.

When I returned from my Asian trip, I detected a complete "numbness" in America. People are performing their duties and functions but it is done with no feeling or self awareness. The whole system seems to have a quality of "numbness", robots with no fresh input, no sensitivity to the world around us. This is most visible in the lack of new ideas for social change, the frustration of community groups, and the repetitious monotypical stories in the news media. I've lost my sense of this now that I am immersed back in this dark pit but before I fell in, I judged my grants in the Sex field to be the only ones that have any direct bearing on this state of the country or offer any hope of a way out.

I will take these grants first. $15,000 for SFSI. I love it because it is seminal in my direct involvement in the sex field, I took the training, I answered the publics phone calls, I got to be with all the other sexually alive people in the project. The project meets other immediate criteria too. Our grant was (a) essential to getting the project started, it has (b) survived after our money ran out and it is the (c) focal point for a whole series of other peoples projects from the Center for Intimacy to women's masturbation clinics. My only advice to my successors is that I went ahead in the beginning knowing that there was no clear administrative skill involved, (other than mine) and as a consequence, it took longer to start (2 months), cost more to operate in its early stages ($2,000) than necessary and finally cost $5,000 more in the form of a second year grant (S.A.R. project) to Margo Rila to be an administrator, and get things running better. (Grant names: Ayres, Rubenstein, Smith, S.A.R. Sexual Awareness).

My book, "The Seven Laws of Money" describes two of my projects, the "Sign in the Desert" and the "Sex Furniture, "so I won't do it here; the effect was primarily on me, not the world so my evaluation hasn't changed. In the "Sign in the Desert", I failed to get a film completed and consequently wasted all of the money involved in that. At present the "positive" rolls exist but the edited version doesn't. Briefly, I hired Corin Masri to do the filming. She backed out because I couldn't deal with her immaturity and complete fickleness. In a last ditch solution, I got Frank Meyers to shoot the film; fine. Later his lack of competence in editing and personal qualities that make it impossible for him to complete projects kept him from finishing. Finally, I asked Horatio Horton , a transient but qualified film editor, recommended by a friend,

to do it; he has the partially edited version and hasn't been heard of since May '73.

LESSON: Filming is expensive; get stable, qualified, mature people to do it (in one word, "professional").

Creative and Extraordinary people project. This can't be evaluated yet. It is progressing (over 4,000 people now) and a test of its potential immediate use is being run in southern California. It's future is unknown. All I know now is that I have a conception of what it is now. It's "pure research" in the social sciences, a concept that I didn't have before and which needs encouragement. Work in physics on "weak interactions" or in astronomy on "quasars" is done "in the interests of knowledge" often without specific hypotheses to test and certainly with no potential material benefits. So is the C. & E. project.

Sex research project. Success and failure simultaneously. In this, we (Peter Sherrill and myself) developed a new technique specifically useful in sex research,(multi-dimensional scaling as described in the attached) but <u>most</u> useful in the future in psychoanalysis, anthropology and encounter groups. It will have powerful effects in all these fields. That's the success! The failure is, so far, in that we (1) gave up the research on sex because the project is too enormous for <u>us personally</u>, even though the methodology is clear and future benefits immense (2) we didn't find anyone to continue the work and (3) we've found no way yet to diseminate information on the new methodology.

LESSON: I don't know; I failed to learn whatever I'm supposed to learn from this. Is it "Field work is great but you need a home office?"

The Corporate Responsibility grants. In the light of my new views, this area has little interest to me and I consequently will not be interested in the future. I don't think it will have 20 - 50 year impact on the society nor change any of the core cultural values. However, in the two main grants in the first year can be seen the epitomies of good and bad grants. The one to Alice Tepper-Marlin ($15,000 agent) is great and is described in The Seven Laws because of its outstanding "alliance" qualities. It has led to nearly all of Dick Raymond's criteria, (1) seminal: in that activism became possible (2) community: the whole Corporate Responsibility movement revolves around Alice (3) great future prospects and many new projects. The fact that Alice ultimately got 10% of Points first 2 years dispursements is a lesson in the hazards of success. When someone is "so wonderful" you had better expect to linger with them a while longer. On the other hand, Gary Near ($10,000 agent) didn't do a thing in my opinion and is my worst grant ("total dollars, lost" times, "disappointment"). Gary is a wonderful, bright, charming and loveable friend. I made the grant on the basis that he would become the West Coast equivalent of Phil Moore, learning the proxy laws and help local groups to wage corporate proxy battles and bring law-expanding suits on Board room issues. We discussed this and I thought it was clearly understood that this is what Gary was going to do. He didn't; he brought a few public interest suits in areas I'm not too interested in though, and has loyally attended most relevent Corporate Responsibility meetings.

Why this went wrong? Clearly, Gary's unexpressed goals and my expressed goals didn't coincide. Possibly, I didn't make my points clear enough by putting them in writing or having Gary do it so it would be out in the open. And possibly I mistook an alpha fish for an alpha plant. Maybe it's not too late, we all have many years to live and this may be much too early to judge, I still have hopes.

Grant to Ida Strickland ($1,000). Good. It led to the results I wanted. The title "To encourage greater activity in third world funding." As planned (I now openly admit) Ida's presence at Foresta seems to have headed off the women's lib assault and brought the urgent issue of racism to the front where, I feel, it is. It is paramount in the building of a new society. As a consequence (I can't honestly say "direct" but I feel it was direct) we had Ida as a near miss board member and ultimately Nathan Hare as our success story on the board.

The San Francisco Focus survey; the first results were only three months ago. Much too early to judge either its' immediate grant qualities or its' role in my long term thinking; so far it's fine.